

Rhetoric – Martial Art or the Art of Winning the Soul by Discourse? Language of Politicians vs. *Ethos*, *Pathos* and *Logos*

203

Joanna Szczepańska-Włoch, Jagiellonian University

Martial art. The art of winning the soul by discourse (Plato).

A collection of stones piled with the aim of laying a mosaic. The style of the mosaic depends on the intentions of the craftsman, the time he lives in; thus everyone leaves his individual mark (Lichański).

The application of reason to imagination “for the better moving of the will” (Bacon).

Summary

“All men [...] up to a certain point, endeavour to criticise or uphold an argument, to defend themselves or to accuse” (Aristotle, 1959: 3). Hence politicians cannot do otherwise and “rhetoric as a technique of argument [...] rather than of ornamentation”, one of the oldest surviving disciplines (Dixon, 1971: 14), whose insights and rules still possess the capacity to adjust to the ideological and social change (Cockcroft and Cockcroft, 2005: 3), is to forward the achievement of the goals politicians work towards. In this study an attempt is made to depict the persuasive dialogue in the functional language, i.e. the language of politicians in the Polish political arena. Prior to that, structuring the content of the article, a theoretical background and methodology are proposed based on *The Art of Rhetoric* by Aristotle (1959). Three kinds of *proofs*, *means of persuasion* or *structural principles* by virtue of which the goal is attained, i.e. *ethos*, *pathos* and *logos*, are addressed. In the part to follow we will analyse several models of arguments which prevail in the political speeches as well as various means of rendering *ethos* and *pathos*.

Key words: language of politicians, inventio, *ethos*, *pathos*, *logos*

1. Introduction

Classical rhetoricians defined rhetoric as *ars bene dicendi*, the art of speaking well, the art or skill conveying *bene* aesthetic beauty and ethical value in *dicendi* oral and written texts (Wilczek, 2009: 8). Plato perceived it as the art of leading (“alluring” or “beguiling” – Asmus, 1986: 156) the soul by means of words – seeing in it its deceptive nature, while Gorgias called it “a means of fascination, peculiar *psychagogia*, spiritual seduction with a magical effect” (Kucz, 2009: 18), holding

“the power to effect ‘most divine’ deeds” (Asmus, 1986: 156). Aristotle (1959: 15) referred to rhetoric as the “the faculty of discovering the possible means of persuasion in reference to any subject whatever”. He argued that rhetoric served “the function of no other of the arts, each of which was able to instruct and persuade in its own special subject”. Rhetoric was not so much to persuade as to find “the existing means of persuasion” (Aristotle, 1959: 13). This belief also “removes rhetoric from the realm of the haphazard and the fanciful” (Dixon, 1971: 14), the charge which was often filed by the Aristotle’s opponents.

Aristotle (1959: 3) in his definition of rhetoric compares rhetoric to dialectic, saying it is its “counterpart [...] for both have to do with matters that are in a manner within the cognizance of all men and not confined to any special science”. He explicates that “all men [...] up to a certain point, endeavour to criticise or uphold an argument, to defend themselves or to accuse”. However, it needs to be emphasised that some do it accidentally, while others do so habitually. We can infer that some do not possess any knowledge of the art of rhetoric, while others grasped the insights and use it to their advantage. The above-mentioned definition applies to the language of politicians, who sometimes appear to criticise or support an argument, or attempt to refute it, or defend it or accuse their opponents of some error in reasoning. It cannot, however, escape our attention that in the contemporary language of politics, public relations play a prominent role. Thus the arcane art of how to address the public is becoming or has already become an indispensable and required skill for every politician wishing to achieve success, even if doing so amounts to blurring his/her real positions. “Rhetoric as a technique of argument [...] rather than of ornamentation” (Dixon, 1971: 14) is to forward its achievement. Even if it constitutes one of the oldest surviving disciplines, its insights and rules still possess the capacity to adjust to the ideological and social change (Cockcroft and Cockcroft, 2005: 3).

2. Data Presentation

The persuasive dialogue in functional language, i.e. the language of politicians, constitutes the central focus of this article. *The Art of Rhetoric* by Aristotle (1959), in turn, serves as the theoretical background structuring the content of the article. Three kinds of *proofs* (*ethos*, *pathos* and *logos*) are discussed, followed by the elaboration of various models of argumentation.

The ultimate success of the persuasive dialogue is subject to the language chosen to fit in with the subject of the interaction, the social con-

text and the audience. Not only the persuader but also the persuadee needs to be involved, for the dialogic interaction entails reciprocal participation and involvement. In the material examined we will concentrate on the pragmatic and linguistic techniques the persuader uses so as to influence the audience. The material comprises two presidential debates held on 27th and 30th June 2010, between two candidates: Jarosław Kaczyński, representing *Prawo i Sprawiedliwość* (*Law and Justice*), and Bronisław Komorowski, the candidate of *Platforma Obywatelska* (*Civic Platform*). The data for the analysis come from the website of *Gazeta Wyborcza*: <http://wyborcza.pl/>. All the extracts have been translated by the author of the article.

3. Stages of Shaping the Composition

Cicero (1948: I. 142, quoted in Dixon, 1971: 24) presents a process of rhetorical composition, in which the orator “must first hit upon what to say; then manage and marshal his discoveries, not merely in orderly fashion, but with a discriminating eye for the exact weight of each argument; next go on to array them in the adornments of style; after that keep them guarded in his memory; and in the end deliver them with effect and charm”. The above-mentioned explication can be transferred into skills which consist of “five phases/stages” (Lichański, 2007: 87; Wilczek, 2009: 9–10): invention (*inventio*), arrangement or disposition (*dispositio*), style (*elocutio*), memory (*memoria*) and delivery (*actio*). Our attention, though, will be attached only to the first stage of the classical composition, namely *inventio*.

3.1. Inventio

Invention, being the skill of finding and collecting material, includes: *proof*, topics, and commonplaces (Dixon, 1971: 24; Lichański, 2007: 96). *Proof*, according to Aristotle (1959: 15), can be *inartificial* or *artificial*, the latter denotes the invention of the speaker, the former the evidence of the law court (Dixon, 1971: 24). In turn, the artificial proof is subdivided into *ethos*, *pathos* and *logos*.

These three kinds of *proofs*, *means of persuasion* or *structural principles* by virtue of which the goal is attained denote: *ethos* “the moral character of the speaker” (persuasion through personality and stance), *pathos* “putting the hearer into a certain frame of mind” (persuasion through the arousal of emotion), and *logos* “the speech itself, in so far as it proves or seems to prove” (persuasion through reasoning) (Aristotle, 1959: 17).

3.1.1. *Ethos*

Aristotle (1959) in defining *ethos* as depending upon “moral character” stresses that it is the “moral character” of the orator that represents the most influential means of *proof* when persuading the audience. He explains that to persuade by means of perceived “moral character” the orator needs to deliver a speech in such a manner that the audience will find him/her worthy of confidence. Following Robert and Susan Cockcroft (2005) *ethos* will be divided into personality and stance.

Personality is rendered as the power to win trust and confidence in the audience, impress them with individuality. Trust, as Garver (1994: 132–138) and Cockcroft and Cockcroft (2005: 16) stress, comprises “moral strength (*arête*), benevolence (*eunoia*)”, “*constructive competence* or the ability to offer shrewd, practical but principled advice (*phronesis*)”. As to the individuality, it translates into differentiating such traits of character that would best suit the audience and the topic. What also affects the persuadee is the level of the individual engagement of the persuader, the higher the level appears to be, the more compelling the persuasion.

Stance equals the persuader’s viewpoint, vantage point, the issue which rests upon the source of the process of interaction, for the success of the exchange cannot be guaranteed in its absence. Stance is inherently interactive, and evinces group values, yet, it is entirely contingent upon the persuader.

The assessment and confidence of the audience placed in the persuader will be substantially dependent on the persuader’s stance, along with the personality and image. The persuader, on the other hand, must be attentive, observe, adjust to the needs of the audience, establish empathy with the audience. Lynette Hunter (1984, quoted in Cockcroft and Cockcroft, 2005: 31) asserts that what matters is not the topic someone relies on, but the manner with which they do so. The persuader can assume either a firm, rigid and authoritative stance; an indecisive and flexible one; or suppress it before disclosing it later. The stance may take the form of a structured and ordered process of interaction or a disorganised and uncontrollable one. Nevertheless, as Quintilian (1920) upholds, no fixed rules are to be found that can facilitate persuasion. Still, pragmatism, adaptability and flexibility in one’s stance are requisite in order that success is guaranteed. Human capability of choosing the rhetorical language facilitating persuasion cannot be excluded as well.

Hunter (1984, quoted in Cockcroft and Cockcroft, 2005: 32) also discriminates between *positive* and *negative rhetoric*, the former expli-

cates the persuader's stance as the interaction progresses, depicting shifts in stance; the latter conceals the values and the standpoint. The part the audience plays is equally significant. The audience must discern the stance, spot the strategy and evaluate its principles. For, as Hunter (ibid.) maintains, there is nothing worse than naiveté of the audience since it results in the audience surrendering to the imposed stance.

3.1.2. *Ethos – Patterns of Behaviour Adopted by the Persuader*

Coming back to the persuader's stance, we shall propose a few patterns of behaviour s/he can exhibit. To begin with, the persuader can prioritise a stance such that the audience perceives the benefits for themselves (*positive face*, *Involvement Strategy* (Scollon and Scollon, 1995)), seeks approval, the positive self-image (Brown and Levinson, 1987; Kasper, 1994; Scollon and Scollon, 1995; Fairclough 1989/2001; Fairclough, 1992/2008). The other pattern relies on the opposite assumption, i.e. the persuader being in the privileged or empowered position threatens the audience with the exclusion of the benefits, hence plays on the emotions, *pathos*, of the audience (*negative face* – the want of self-determination, the claim to territories, personal preserves, rights to non-distraction). Tactics described above reflect the concept of saving or threatening *face* rooted in Brown and Levinson's theory.¹

As a subsequent tactic worth drawing our attention to, the persuader may adopt lies on the belief that "being yourself" does not entail success. Customarily, the persuader needs to implement intuition and calculation in displaying his/her stance, determine how much of self, image and personality to propose so that it will not discourage a prospective listener. Too personal or too impersonal a stance can be equally counter-effective (Hunter, 1984).

Likewise, humour can serve as a tactic deployed by the persuader. It conveys either a release of tension, acts as a reflection of a non-serious stance, or an embodiment of the persuader's personality, being the consequence of his/her conviction. Lastly, it can also function as a gun that cons the audience into falsehood, ergo yields dubious benefits.

Changing sides by the persuader and his/her willingness to admit it openly constitutes a strategy which, if managed skilfully, can bring a desirable effect. Nonetheless, it appears to be risky and requires a considerable skill. For the inconsistency of stance can exert an adverse impact and lead to the feeling of distrust on the part of the audience (ibid.).

1 For details on the aspect of *face* with reference to the language of politicians, see Szczepańska-Włoch (2010).

Stance and personality are realised by basic features of language that, as Cockcroft and Cockcroft (2005: 38) suggest, “lay the foundations of meaning and human contact”. The dialectic of persuasion is to be grounded in three functions propounded by Halliday (1973), i.e. *ideational* (ideas about the real world), *interpersonal* (social relationships), and *textual* (realisation of language choices). All the functions enumerated must be fulfilled so that the persuasive character of *ethos* is communicated. The first one – *ideational*, say, can be realised by making use of the language depicting the persuadees’s experience; the second one – *interpersonal* – by the use of modal verbs (expressing possibility, uncertainty, criticism, expectation, etc.), and personal pronouns (showing distance); the *textual* function – by virtue of textual cohesion and coherence: verb tense, syntax, word order and variation of sentence type.

To illustrate the above points and to see how politicians realise *ethos*, two extracts from the presidential debate held on 27th June 2010 are presented. In the first extract Jarosław Kaczyński (a leader of *Prawo i Sprawiedliwość*) responds to the question on the equality of opportunities between regions in Poland:

- (1) We have two conceptions in Poland. One, in short, is called the conception of motor force and it is the conception of concentrating resources in those regions of the country in which we can already encounter a substantial level of prosperity, in addition, it has been estimated that the above-mentioned level of prosperity will later spread over other regions of our homeland. And there is the conception of the balanced development, of which I am a loyal supporter and which I developed when I was the Prime Minister. It is the conception of a special support for those regions of Poland, which suffer – through no fault of theirs in general, most often through no fault of theirs – a certain backwardness. It was articulated by an algorithm of the implementation of the European funds, very beneficial for the least favoured voivodeships [a voivodeship – a Polish administrative district equivalent to a province—ftn. JSW], in particular those in the east, as well as special programmes, which we managed to win for those voivodeships in Brussels. In short, we are of the opinion that a “good” development of Poland is equivalent to a balanced development, and it is essentially in the interest of all of us. For the reason that nowhere in the world the development via those so-called motor forces – it has its scholarly name I will not allude to – brought desirable effects, islands of prosperity and the ocean of stagnation were established, or such spheres where the reverse process took place, where they were getting poorer. In short, it would be better if we do not try to implement that conception, I refer to it because

the present government has proposed such sorts of plans under such scholarly terms. Those are the plans which are not compatible with what is going on in Poland, since it is not that those metropolises are developing so rapidly in Poland, and, I repeat, that conception has not been checked anywhere in the world. Here our standpoint is firm, my standpoint is univocal, as the President of the Republic of Poland, I will do everything to make Poland develop in a balanced manner.

After a brief introduction of two concepts of the economic reform of Poland, Jarosław Kaczyński openly presents his firm standpoint in saying “I am a loyal supporter”, via the use of the first person singular pronoun “I” he emphasises his view. Only twice does he use “I”, in the *exordium* and *peroratio* stages of the speech, to open and close his composition, with the aim of demonstrating his rigid stance (*interpersonal function*). By contrast, in the course of his speech Kaczyński repeats the first person plural pronoun “we” four times, thus he identifies with his party and reflects their values, or wishes to “get closer” to the audience and warm (improve) his image (Fairclough, 1989/2001). Kaczyński also repeats the phrase: “through no fault of theirs in general, most often through no fault of theirs”, to claim common ground with the audience (*ideational function*), or rather prospective voters, i.e. the inhabitants of the disadvantaged regions, the reason being to win their votes. By referring to the “so-called motor force” and “scholarly term”, he depreciates the government’s policy, moreover, with a derogatory tone. Further, he claims common ground with the people, distances himself from the world of science, often perceived as foreign to the average citizen of the country². Subsequently, he refutes the opponent’s idea by displaying its uselessness. He concludes his speech by confirming his stance.

In the second excerpt Bronisław Komorowski (a candidate of *Platforma Obywatelska* for the presidential seat), being interviewed about the problem of legalization of homosexual relationships, declares:

(2) So, there is a question whether a new law should be established. For in accordance with the Polish law, in effect at present, there is a possibility for inheriting, there is a possibility for medical care for all the people living in such relationships, which are not marriages, except for a few cases concerning, among others, adoption rights I cannot imagine that in Poland such a bill can ever be brought forward to the president’s office, since it is some-

2 It needs to be emphasised that politicians appear to juggle that strategy; depending on the aim they strive to achieve they either distance themselves from the world of science or show their affiliation with it.

thing different to create possibilities for living together and taking care of each other, and inheriting, and it is something different to go in the direction of mechanisms, or regulations, which concern a sphere, or a traditional model of family. I suppose that it is rather a fancy question, because I don't expect that such a legislative initiative is probable in the nearest future, it is rather being talked about in quite narrow circles. One should be decent towards everyone, we should not be too inquisitive about the private lives of others, but we can also solve problems of people living in such relationships decently, in accordance with the law currently in effect. If it turned out that something is missing, that some mechanisms require polishing up, that, for example, there is no easy access to medical care, when somebody goes to hospital, so such a bill should be enforced in the name of political decency. But we shouldn't mix it with a problem of marriage, adoption or other situations of that type, which are confined to the marriage of people of different sex.

The question posed by the interviewer appears to be somewhat controversial, especially for a politician representing a right-wing and centre-right-wing party. Nevertheless, even if Komorowski evades answering the question, he does not conceal his standpoint. Later, we can decipher that he is in favour of a traditional family model, though, it is expressed covertly (*ideational function*). He makes use of hedges of casual conversation, such as "I suppose", modal verbs: "can", negative form of "can" – "cannot", "should", a conditional structure to avoid answering (*textual function*). He does so in the face of an oncoming election and in order not to discourage a part of his electorate. Komorowski's lexical choice, the use of colloquial or humorous words, e.g. "fancy" (in Polish *wydułmany* denoting something "unlikely, improbable, fake" (*Słownik Języka Polskiego*), or "trivial, made-up, far-fetched" (*Słownik Synonimów*)) or a not very complex syntax, as well as an impersonal style also serve to create his positive image (*interpersonal function*). The aforementioned factors contribute to the adaptability and flexibility of the candidate, factors which guarantee success in the political discourse, which in turn is persuasive in its nature.

To recapitulate, Quintilian maintains that "no man can be a good orator unless he is a good man" (*Non posse oratorem esse nisi virum bonum* – Quintilian, 1907: 416 [12.1.1], quoted in Kucz, 2009: 31). Plato (1973: 83), on the other hand, holds that the persuader is an "expert in rhetorical subtlety", equipped with the knowledge of speech cohesion and coherence (structure of the speech) enabling to offer proof, but without any insight into and consideration of truthfulness or real knowledge of

the subject. Which perception appears to be closer to the contemporary definition of the persuader-politician? With the power of PR prevailing in the public eye, shaping the *ethos* of every celebrity in such a manner that by means of distinctiveness s/he becomes persuasive, losing the real meaning on the way, the answer is: the latter. Today, Aristotelian *ethos* is substituted for a highly powerful “image” exerting a considerable effect on the persuasive language, the success of which is often founded on the image (dress, speech), and political charisma (voice, language, or appearance).

3.1.3. *Pathos*

Pathos is equivalent to persuasion through an emotion that is roused (Aristotle, 1959: 17), thus the orator by virtue of “a certain frame of mind” entices the audience. The persuader will intentionally use an emotional appeal, which many a time constitutes a source of distrust of rhetoric, owing to “its association with insincerity, irrationality and rabble-rousing” (Cockcroft and Cockcroft, 2005: 55). It seems that there is no other way but to employ emotions to manipulate the audience. After all, as Damasio (1999, quoted in Cockcroft and Cockcroft, 2005: 55) holds “humans cannot think properly unless, as a prior condition, they feel”. Downes (2000, in Cockcroft and Cockcroft, 2005: 55) adds that what we feel mirrors what we think by means of semiotic systems, i.e. verbal and non-verbal signs. Nonetheless, it should be propounded that emotions can obscure the view, preventing people from gaining a broader and a true perspective on the issues raised, and when out of control can threaten and discourage the audience.

Cockcroft and Cockcroft (2005: 57) propose two kinds of emotions: *universal* and *contingent*. The former reflects emotions common to humanity (e.g. joy, anger, fear), the latter emotions as socially conditioned manifestation (e.g. pride, contempt, indignation, guilt). Both are culture-specific, context-dependent, historically-bound and central to persuasive rhetoric. Both are present in literary and functional persuasion, though universal emotion is often associated with literary persuasion or formal discourse (Nash, 1989).

The use of *pathos* by the orator will in a substantial manner depend on the agreement between the persuader, the topic and the audience in a socially structured context. Notwithstanding, it is within the ability of the speaker or writer that s/he adjusts the language to match the topic raised and to appeal to the audience. Therefore it is language that plays a vital role in the persuasive discourse. It is also via language that

the standpoint, the prejudices the persuader holds are unveiled. Ergo at this point we return to the interdependence of thought, feeling, and language (and its social context).³

Following Cicero and Quintilian (1920), vivid and graphic language appears to be a persuasive factor, enabling the actualisation of emotions. The above-mentioned authors use *energeia* and *fantasia* to influence the hearer, *energeia* renders clarity, *fantasia* imagination. A subsequent factor carrying a highly persuasive aim, somewhat different than the above one, is the use of abstract concepts, such as *honour*, *patriotism*, or *justice*. The orator making use of the cited concepts may move the audience substantially by alluding to the topics they regard highly. Such a strategy resorts to the individual strongly-held beliefs and values, which assure the audience of the truthfulness of the persuader and arouse greater confidence in him. Again, we revert to the pragmatic concept of *face*, in the aforesaid example we can perceive *positive face* realised by claiming common ground, the approval of each other, shared wants and shared knowledge, and reciprocity of obligations (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 62).

Finally, it should be borne in mind that playing on *pathos* can either facilitate the understanding of a logical argument, helping to acknowledge it, or obscure the logical judgement of an argument advanced by the persuader. The persuader wishing to be effective in the art of persuasion must acquire all skills indispensable in influencing the audience, should monitor the response, converge with beliefs and convictions of the audience, reverse his own standpoint, if required. It becomes clear that the persuader must acquire psycholinguistic knowledge, i.e. the complexities of the human character, so as to rate the responses of the audience and shape them effectively. All the ploys stated above are realised by means of language, which occupies a paramount role. *Pathos* is actualised with the help of argument and repetition, together with stylistic structures, such as antithesis, metaphors and rhythmic patterns, syntactic structures, i.e. fronting, word order, interrogatives, and lexis, i.e. vivid and descriptive adjectives (Nash, 1989; Cockcroft and Cockcroft, 2005).

3 At this point I wish to draw our attention to the significance of language and its social context in the process of discourse analysis. I advocate a view that language does not exist in isolation. Fairclough (1989/2001, 1992/2008) in his framework for the textual analysis of discourse or critical discourse analysis explicates that no analysis is reliable without careful examination of three dimensions: textual, discursive and social. Van Dijk (1998), in turn, stresses that language users in a communicative act rely on social acts, participate in a form of dialogue, which cannot be isolated from social and cultural context. Finally, Bourdieu (2008) highlights that language does not exist for its own sake, language is determined by the relation it bears with the speakers who bring it into use and who possess language competence, therefore to interact the whole social structure is required.

The following passage is taken from the presidential debate held on 27th June 2010, Bronisław Komorowski responds to the question on the separation of state and church, as well as financing *in vitro* fertilization:

(3) Ladies and gentleman, not only do I understand a problem of paternity, but also, simply, raised five children. Five times did I experience happiness of being a parent, a father, and I am the last person who would wish to deprive young marriages or couples of hope, chances, and there are twenty per cent of couples in Poland, who cannot have children. [...]. But we cannot deprive others of that hope. The issues concerning a system of faith, or an ethical one – here everyone needs to take decisions in his own conscience whether to employ such method, regarding it as effective, or not. Personally, I was, am and will be a supporter of the conciliar principle in effect between the church and the state, namely mutual respect, respect for the autonomy of the church by the state and the state by the church [...]. But the compromise is of high importance, the compromise which was arrived at while working on the anti-abortion law, which allows specific exceptions connected also to human life, but it is utterly the law protecting life. I was, am and will always be an advocate of life, I have experienced happiness five times, life of my own children, welcoming lives of my own children, I will not deny anybody the right to happiness.

Bearing in mind the theoretical background on *pathos* explicated above, we can enumerate a number of ploys to which Bronisław Komorowski resorts, the first being the use of abstract concepts, e.g. *happiness, hope, faith, conscience, ethics, religion*. By evoking abstract categorization, Komorowski appeals to the emotions of the audience reflecting their values, aspirations and experience, the concept of *positive face* is also brought into play. He is aware of the fact that by alluding to the concepts the audience prizes greatly, he will win their votes. Moreover, he places himself in the position of an expert owing to the experience he has gained, making himself worthy of being trusted. Komorowski is sure of his opinion and voices it firmly. Nevertheless, finding some space for a compromise he, conversely, displays openness and flexibility. In the field of the stylistic and syntactic structures we can also spot some examples, i.e. rhythmic patterns, emphatic structures and repetition.

3.1.4. *Logos*

Logos denotes “reasoned discourse”, argument from reason. According to Aristotle (1959: 17), *logos* relates to “the speech itself, in so far as it proves or seems to prove”. Persuasion “by speech itself” can be achieved only if “the true” or “apparently true” can be extracted from the ways

of persuasion within the particular subject. Paul A. Rahe (2008: 23) adds that *logos* “makes it possible [...] to perceive and make clear to others through reasoned discourse the difference between what is advantageous and what is harmful, between what is just and what is unjust, and between what is good and what is evil”, which undeniably differentiates us from animals.

Logos is composed of an issue lying at the heart of a debate which needs to be identified, arguments which will support the issue addressed, the structure of thought which underpins the arguments, coherence and logical value.

Prior to examining which classes of arguments the speakers or writers employ in the persuasive process of the genre under investigation, we shall elaborate on their types. Aristotle (1959: 265) distinguishes three classes of arguments which need to be applied by the orators, firstly, the topic of the possible and impossible, secondly, that a thing will happen or has happened, thirdly, the topic of magnitude. The possible explicates that of two contrary things one is possible, so is the other one; analogically, if of two similar things, one is possible, so is the other one (an argument *a fortiori*). The possible, therefore, constitutes the source of arguments for the impossible being the opposite of what has been said about the possible. As to a thing that will happen or has happened, Aristotle (1959: 173–273) maintains that if a foundation is laid to believe or if a certain premise has been made that something has happened or will happen, then something will most probably have happened. Finally, *topos* of magnitude, Aristotle (ibid.) holds that all men use extenuation and amplification (exaggeration of both great and small things) in deliberating, praising or blaming, accusing or defending, for “the particular has more authority than the general”. Not only can the topics of argument stimulate the persuader’s mind, but also structure the persuasive discourse, enabling the speaker/writer to make use of all available means, which consequently serve the speaker in preparing his/her compositions. Nevertheless, topics, if applied too scrupulously, can deprive a composition of its originality and inventiveness.

Cockcroft and Cockcroft (2005: 83–107), in turn, provide us with ten models of argument, as they call them, substituting *topoi* with models, meaning “adaptable, flexible concepts”, offering “systematic and organising methods of ‘thinking through’ a topic, and of selecting and organising the most effective arguments”. The models of argument which will be discussed are as follows: *definition, cause and effect, similarity, op-*

positional, degree, testimony, genus/species, part/whole, associational, and root meaning.

The *definition model* of argument implies that the speaker or writer makes use of the general category so as to move to the unique feature of a point discussed. Thus, in a persuasive discourse every definition might incite a counter-definition. The *cause and effect model* embodies an integral part of a persuasive process, both in literary and functional discourse, although it takes a different form in each of them. In the language of politicians, which is our central focus, it is effect-centred, since the said ploy seems to be more convincing. Nonetheless, it is not devoid of predicaments (e.g. oversimplification, disproportion etc.) Cockcroft and Cockcroft (ibid.) identify three processes of cause and effect, the first being a simple cause producing a simple effect, the second a complex cause producing a simple effect, the last one a complex cause producing a complex effect. We need to accentuate that the *cause and effect model* is grounded in the dialectical process. Comparison and parallelism emerge to be the key issues of the *similarity model* of argument. The *oppositional model*, on the other hand, depicts contradictory motifs. We can enumerate a few sub-varieties of the model: *contraries, contradictions, privatives and relatives*. Similarly to the *cause and effect model*, the aforementioned model of argument is present in a dialectical process, involving two-way interaction, not infrequent in the language of politicians, in which one thread of thinking is adopted ruling out at the same time the other one. Such an argument lies at the basis of provocation. The *degree model of argument* constitutes the third common *topos* referred to in political rhetoric by Aristotle, together with the similarity and oppositional models. It rests upon constant dynamics, desirability of a goal, instrumental means of achieving it (ibid.). The subsequent type, i.e. the *testimony model*, is founded on the credibility of a witness, as a consequence it is considered as one of the weakest topics. The *testimony model* is to be encountered in television broadcasts, notably political interviews, for its declarative function, in which the political figures display their loyalty and support for a particular standpoint or a political party or offers certain instruction, hence it often acts as an ideological weapon. The *genus/species* type of argument carries an interactional function, in which the speakers after initiating a discussion, making a statement, refute each other's arguments, moving from genus to species, or further to sub-species. The *part/whole model* appears to correspond to the previous model of argument. What differentiates it from the former is that the genus/species can exist

separately, while parts and wholes are co-dependent. In the *association-al model* the hearer is manipulated by false logical and ethical assumptions. The above argument can be sub-divided into subject/adjunct (a quality, condition of a subject being its basis), lifestyle/status (an argument, the basis of which being lifestyle/status), place/function (place/function taking the role of a premise), or time/activity (an argument reflecting people's expectations and social rituals) association models of argument (ibid.). Lastly, the *root meaning* category of argument typifies one of the most manipulative models of argument, the persuader changes the received meaning of a word used and searches for the hidden or alternative meaning.

3.15. *Models of Argument Versus Language of Politicians*

After having examined two presidential debates held on 27th and 30th June 2010, we can come to a number of conclusions. Firstly, there are several models of argument which prevail in the political speeches – namely, *cause and effect*, *degree*, *genus and species*, *associational* and *oppositional* (of dialectical nature); the rationale being its persuasive and emotive functions, as well as vivid distinctiveness in the values and standpoint the politicians have adopted. Secondly, the remaining models are either too sophisticated and would require greater expertise or are not beneficial enough to be used in the political discourse. Lastly, the choice of arguments is highly dependent on loyalty and ideology of a politician, the party s/he adheres to determines a line of attack he pursues.

Let us now provide a few examples of the above-mentioned models:

1/ *definition model of argument*, in which a generalisation is narrowed down into a precise meaning:

(4) Jarosław Kaczyński: [...] privatization, as I have already said, conveys an introduction of entirely different rules of the game. A private hospital will have a possibility to sign an agreement with the National Fund, though it will not be required, and there is every likelihood that such a situation will take place that people belonging to a low income group will simply not have an easy access to treatment, at least in their towns/cities.

2/ *cause and effect model of argument*, Bronisław Komorowski by means of a conditional sentence explicates that the effect of a fall of a standard of living will be emigration to Great Britain – a simple effect produced by a simple cause; in the second example granted that liberal ideology is challenged, Poland will become a more prosperous country – seemingly⁴ a simple effect of a simple cause:

4 I deliberately use the word "seemingly" for the argument is simple only in wording.

- (5) Bronisław Komorowski: If the standard of living is improved, nobody will go to Great Britain.
- (6) Jarosław Kaczyński: [...] only when we reject liberal ideology [...] only then will we bring about development of Poland.
- 3/ *similarity model of argument* – the following example rests upon parallelism of the process, the speaker's understanding of a problem is linked to his memory-based schemata, that is the speaker's experience:
 - (7) Bronisław Komorowski: Ladies and gentleman, not only do I understand a problem of paternity, but I also, simply, raised five children.
- 4/ *oppositional model of argument* – the example below is grounded in a dialectical process, involving two-way interaction between two participants. Jarosław Kaczyński responds to the question on equal opportunities between Poland A and B. He firmly states that such a division is present in Poland; at the same time he provides solutions to the problem. In turn, Bronisław Komorowski denies that the division exists (the argument Bronisław Komorowski employed might have been borrowed from Barak Obama's 2004 Democratic Convention Keynote speech in which he said that "There are no red states. There are no blue states. There is only the United States of America", the speech that earned Barak Obama widespread and well-deserved recognition with respect to successful rhetoric):
 - (8) Bronisław Komorowski: There is one Poland, there is neither Poland A nor B, nor C nor D. There is no north, south, west or east Poland. There is one Poland and we need to take care of it, and the government does it.
- 5/ *degree model of argument* – both examples are founded on the qualitative aspect of argument saying that one thing is better/cheaper, etc. than another one:
 - (9) Bronisław Komorowski: It is important for the professional army, such is always better [...]
 - (10) Bronisław Komorowski: For sure Poland is much stronger than in 1997 [...]
- 6/ *testimony model of argument* – considered one of the weakest of *topoi*, however, in the political discourse it may be used as an ideological weapon. In the example to follow, the interviewee instructs the audience how to act, he also accentuates his stance by the use of *anaphora*:
 - (11) Jarosław Kaczyński: It is an old teaching of Giedroyc, it is an old teaching of Józef Piłsudski, we should make use of it and we should all go this way.

- 7/ *genus/species model of argument* – the following dialectical model of argument is based on the pattern: *genus* to *species*, *species* to *sub-species*, etc. By way of illustration, Bronisław Komorowski makes an assumption, in turn Jarosław Kaczyński counters this assumption with a subsequent example, the procedure further continues. In the example to follow we can also spot *aitiologia* (a rhetorical figure (trope), in which the same speaker asks and later answers a question posed), a ploy popular in political rhetoric:

(12) Bronisław Komorowski: Facts are on our side: is there half a billion for the University of Rzeszów? Yes, there is. Is there an improvement of an algorithm calculating money for health sector? Yes, there is. You took it away, we will give it and that's the difference. There is no point in alluding to theories, of one kind or another, facts are unrelenting (undeniable) Mr Chairman, and that's all, full stop.

Jarosław Kaczyński: I also have some time, so I will say: half a billion is much less than, for example, twelve billion for Gęsicka's plans. Well, Mr Speaker, you won't escape from it.

Bronisław Komorowski: Well, Mr Chairman, you can promise twelve billion, but you didn't give a penny, but we will give half a billion.

Jarosław Kaczyński: It came from the European funds.

- 8/ *part/whole model of argument* – in which the part represents the whole, in the example below, the speaker enumerates consequences of an economic crisis pertaining to supply estimates and public expenditure, which represent *parts* of a larger *whole*:

(13) Bronisław Komorowski: The Italians cut clerks' salaries, pensions [...]

- 9/ *associational model of argument* – it provokes the user to make false logical assumptions, as may be the case of the example to follow:

(14) Jarosław Kaczyński: [...] contrary to what the Minister of Foreign Affairs of that government claims, so I presume so does Mr Speaker [...]

- 10/ *root meaning model of argument* – characteristic of manipulation, the interviewee deliberately searches for an alternative meaning of a word to manipulate. In the context mentioned the speaker uses the word: "report" sarcastically, for it was uttered by the brother of his opponent after he won the election in 2005, in the form: *I report that the task has been completed* (originally the statement was not used to display complete dependence, which this word may denote, but to express contentment resulting from victory). Bronisław Komorowski, however, attempts to distort the meaning by referring to it literally since he wishes to show that he is an independent politician:

- (15) Bronisław Komorowski: [...] I will not file a report to the Prime Minister [...]

4. Conclusion

In every discourse where persuasion is the primary goal we observe the co-existence of the structural principles: *ethos*, *pathos* and *logos*. The type of interaction, personality, stance, as well as emotional appeal may determine the choice of arguments. Conversely, the choice of arguments may reflect the influence arguments exert on emotions and standpoint adopted by the persuader. The process is simultaneous. Quintilian (quoted in Dixon, 1971: 25) maintained that every aspect of speech enhances character: the tone reveals the orator's good will towards the audience, the ordering of arguments reflects his/her intelligence and sense of values, while the feelings expressed embody the goodness of his/her heart. Ergo the orator should be able to comprehend psychology, know the values of the audience and respond to them effectively and truthfully.

Tactics employed by the speaker include postulating the irrelevance of the opponent's argument, by showing its ambiguity, inconsistency or preposterousness. In effective persuasion the issue, the arguments and their relevance must stand in line since an attentive hearer will perceive any incoherence and lack of cohesion upon which they are grounded. Correspondingly, the more the persuader understands his audience, the more s/he will be compelling.

According to classical rhetoric, all the arguments are or can be polar opposites, "either/or", hence they can limit a free mind. The composition, structurally controlled, systematised and classified, may cramp a free development of ideas. Aristotelian rhetoric offers a form of argument, not a compromise, *agony* being its aim (Dixon, 1971; Budzyńska-Daca, 2008). The language of politics appears to draw interest from that rhetoric, in which it has inexorably settled, for the aim of the political discourse is tantamount to that of rhetoric, even if it has, in the opinion of its opponents, become morally suspect, "the art of the purple passage and the debating trick, language masquerading as thought" (Dixon, 1971: 1–2, 70), language used so as to "influence, persuade, perhaps to exhort and instruct", language used to manipulate, language requiring consummate skills.

In sum, on one hand, we can defend a position adopted by Cap (2005, 2006, quoted in Skowrońska, 2010), who upholds that "skilful use of language is not only an asset, but a must in legitimization" of politics, "broadly defined as the ultimate goal sought by politicians". On

the other one, following Chilton (2004: 23), we can accept the assumption that every political speaker needs to “imbue their utterances with evidence, authority and truth”. According to Aristotle, word has to be bound with being, as a remedy for abuse and manipulation within human cognition (Stefańczyk, 2000, quoted in Kucz, 2009: 22). The question arises: does anybody attach any importance to actions in the era of power of mass media? Do actions speak louder than words? Highly debatable. A word is the weapon in Plato’s rhetoric, something you use to fight with the opponent’s view, or rather with him/her in person, something you apply to defend, refute or maintain the stance adopted, something fulfilling a conative function, finally, something lying on the brink of manipulation. Ergo does rhetoric render martial art or the art of winning the soul by discourse? Both, depending on the perspective we adopt or, more probable, on the goal a politician wishes to achieve.

References

- Andrews, R. (1992). *Rebirth of Rhetoric*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Aristotle (1959). *The Art of Rhetoric*, London: William Heinemann Ltd.
- Arystoteles (2008). *Retoryka. Retoryka dla Aleksandra. Poetyka*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Arystoteles (2010). *Polityka*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Asmus, E. (1986). *Psychagogia in Plato’s Phaedrus*, Illinois Classical Studies, 11/1–2, 153–157.
- Barłowska, M., A. Budzyńska-Daca, and P. Wilczek (2008). *Retoryka*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Barłowska, M (2008). Amplifikacja retoryczna. Barłowska, M., et al. (eds.). *Retoryka*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 98–115.
- Black, E. (1965). *Rhetorical Criticism*, New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Bourdieu, P. (2008). Language and Symbolic Power. Jaworski, A., and N. Coupland (eds.). *The Discourse Reader*. London and New York: Routledge, 480–490.
- Brown, P., and S. C. Levinson (1987). *Politeness*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Buckler, W. E., and A. B. Sklare (1966). *Essentials of Rhetoric*, New York: The Macmillan Company.

- Budzyńska-Daca, A. (2008). Sztuka argumentacji. Barłowska, M., et al. (eds.). *Retoryka*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 57–76.
- Burke, K. (2008). Tradycyjne zasady retoryki. Skwara, M. (ed.). *Retoryka*. Gdańsk: Słowo/Obraz Terytoria, 35–38.
- Cap, P. (2010). Axiological Proximity. Plisiecka-Witczak, I. (ed.). *Pragmatics of Semantically-Restricted Domains. Vol. II*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 3–20.
- Chapman, R. (1973). *Linguistics and Literature*, London: Edward Arnold.
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing Political Discourse*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Chilton, P. (1998). Politics and Language. Mey, J. L. (ed.). *Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics*. Oxford: Elsevier Science Ltd, 688–695.
- Cockcroft, R., and S. Cockcroft (2005). *Persuading People*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Dijk, T. van. (ed.) (1998). *Discourse as Structure and Process, Vol. I*, London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Dijk, T. van. (ed.) (1998). *Discourse as Social Interaction, Vol. II*, London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Dijk, T. van. (ed.) (2001). *Dyskurs jako struktura i proces*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Dixon, P. (1971). *Rhetoric*, London: Methuen and Co Ltd.
- Dobrzyńska, T. (2003). *Tekst – styl – poetyka*, Kraków: Universitas.
- Douglass, R. B. (2008). Arystotelesowska koncepcja komunikacji retorycznej. Skwara, M. (ed.). *Retoryka*. Gdańsk: Słowo/Obraz Terytoria, 86–96.
- Fairclough, N. (1989/2001). *Language and Power*, London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1992/2008). *Discourse and Social Change*, Cambridge: Polity.
- Fairclough, N., and R. Wodak (1998). Critical Discourse Analysis. Dijk, T. Van (ed.). *Discourse as Social Interaction. Vol. II*. London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: Sage Publications, 258–284.
- Fish, S. (2002). *Interpretacja retoryka, polityka*, Kraków: Universitas.
- Garver, E. (1994). *Aristotle's Rhetoric: An Art of Character*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gazeta Edu. <http://slowniki.gazeta.pl/pl> (30. June 2010).
- Gazeta Wyborcza. <http://wyborcza.pl/> (30. June 2010).
- Gordon, G. N. (1971). *Persuasion*, New York: Hastings House Publishers.

- Joseph, J. E. (2006). *Language and Politics*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Kasper, G. (1994). Politeness. Asher, R. E. et al. *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Edinburgh: Pergamon and University of Aberdeen Press, 3206–3212.
- Kucz, A. (2008). Retoryka i oratorstwo w starożytności. Barłowska, M. et al. (ed.). *Retoryka*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 17–34.
- Lakoff, G., and M. Johnson (2003). *Metaphors We Live by*, Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lemmermann, H. (1999). *Komunikacja werbalna. Szkoła retoryki*, Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Astrum.
- Lichański, J. (1996). *Co to jest retoryka?*, Kraków: Polska Akademia Nauk.
- Lichański, J. Z. (2000). *Retoryka. Od renesansu do współczesności – tradycja i innowacja*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo DiG.
- Lichański, J. Z. (2007). *Retoryka. Historia – Teoria – Praktyka*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo DiG.
- Nash, W. (1989). *Rhetoric: The Wit of Persuasion*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Musolff, A. (2004). *Metaphor and Political Discourse*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ożóg, K. (2004). *Język w służbie polityki*, Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Rzeszowskiego.
- Quintilian. *Institution Oratoria*, translated by H. E. Butler, 4 vols., London: Heinemann, 1920–22.
- Rahe, P. A. (2008). *Against Throne and Altar: Machiavelli and Political Theory under the English Republic*, Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Schopenhauer, A. (2007). *Erystyka*, Kraków: Verso.
- Skwara, M. (2008). *Retoryka*, Gdańsk: Słowo/Obraz Terytoria.
- Sowińska, A. (2010). Going Nukelear: On Manipulation in Bush's and Ahmadinejad's Legitimisation of Nuclear Power. Plisiecka-Witczak, I. (ed.). *Pragmatics of Semantically-Restricted Domains. Vol. II*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 21–50.
- Szczepańska-Włoch, J. (2010). Aspects of Conduct in Polish and British TV News Interviews with Politicians. Plisiecka-Witczak, I. (ed.). *Pragmatics of Semantically-Restricted Domains. Vol. II*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 127–145.

- Sztachelska, J., J. Maciejewski, and E. Dąbrowicz (2004). *Teatr wymowy*, Białystok: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu w Białymstoku.
- Wiedzy PWN. <http://sjp.pwn.pl/slownik> (10. April 2012).
- Wierzbicka, E., A. Wolański, and D. (2008). *Zdunkiewicz-Jedynak. Podstawy stylistyki i retoryki*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Załęska, M. (2008). Retoryka a językoznawstwo. Barłowska, M. (ed.). *Retoryka*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 173–191.
- Zdunkiewicz-Jedynak, D. (2008). *Wykłady ze stylistyki*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.